

SN 09/737,841

Page 6 of 8

### REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Advisory Action mailed July 6, 2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 1-13, 16, 18, 21-24 and 29 are pending and rejected.

By this response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include language substantially similar to that noted as missing by the Examiner in the Advisory Action.

It is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant responsive amendment.

### REJECTIONS

#### 35 U.S.C. §103

##### Claims 1-13, 16, 18, 21-24 and 29

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-13, 16, 18, 21-24 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,548, hereinafter "Hendricks") in view of Alonso et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,184,873, hereinafter "Alonso") and further in view of Eyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,545, hereinafter "Eyer"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the following:

"A method for targeting programming according to subscriber preferences, comprising:

propagating, via a forward application transport channel (FATC), a plurality of video streams representing respective pages of an interactive program guide (IPG), each IPG page depicting programming associated with a respective pair of channel groups and time slots;

polling the plurality of terminals for trend data, the trend data being generated by an application executing at the plurality of terminals, the trend data including preference indicative information, the preference indicative information including subscriber selections received at the terminals;

383331-1

SN 09/737,841

Page 7 of 8

receiving, via a back channel, subscriber selections associated with at least one IPG page;  
determining trend data associated with accumulated subscriber selections; and  
adapting at least one IPG page in response to said determined trend data."

Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include language substantially similar to that noted as missing by the Examiner in the Advisory Action.

As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not obvious and fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and is patentable thereunder. Furthermore, claims 2-13, 16, 18, 21-24, and 29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 and recite additional features thereof. As such, and at least for the same reasons as discussed above, Applicants submit that these dependent claims also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe all the claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of an adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

7/21/05

E J Wall

Eamon J. Wall, Attorney  
Registration No. 39,414  
(732) 530-9404

383331-1

SN 09/737,841

Page 8 of 8

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
Attorneys at Law  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

383331-1